THE

RECONSTRUCTIONIST

DEDICATED TO THE ADVANCEMENT OF JUDAISM AS A RELIGIOUS CIVILIZATION, TO THE UPBUILDING OF ISRAEL'S ANCIENT HOMELAND, AND TO THE FURTHERANCE OF UNIVERSAL FREEDOM, JUSTICE AND PEACE.

Vol. III. May 14, 1937. Sivan 4, 5697. No. 7.

EDITORIALS

THE WRONG AND THE RIGHT APPROACH TO THE PROBLEM OF DIVORCE

THE RELIGIOUS EDUCATION ASSOCIATION

THE CATHOLIC CRUSADE AGAINST COMMUNISM

By Louis Minsky

AN EXPERIMENT IN APPLIED RELIGION

By Albert I. Gordon

THE RESURRECTION OF THE JEWISH SPIRIT

By Mordecai M. Kaplan

Published by

THE SOCIETY FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF JUDAISM

15 West 86th Street, New York, N. Y.

READERS OF THE RECONSTRUCTIONIST WHO LIVE IN BROOKLYN, N. Y.! ATTENTION!

You are cordially invited to attend

A Reconstructionist Forum

— on —

Tuesday Evening, May 25th

at THE JEWISH COMMUNITY HOUSE, Bensonhurst, 7802 Bay Parkway, Brooklyn

SUBJECT:

The Organization of the Jewish Community

The speakers will be members of the RECONSTRUCTIONIST Editorial Board

COME AND BRING YOUR FRIENDS!

SUBSCRIPTION BLANK

THE RECONSTRUCTIONIST,
15 West 86th Street,
New York, N. Y.

Enclosed please find $.....for.....year's (s') subscription to the RECONSTRUCTIONIST.

NAME .....

ADDRESS .....

Annual Subscription—$1.00
Foreign—$1.25

THE
RECONSTRUCTIONIST

Vol. III. May 14, 1937. Sivan 4, 5697. No. 7.

EDITORIAL BOARD

MORDECAI M. KAPLAN, Chairman

Michael Alper
Ben Zion Bokser
Israel S. Chipkin
Samuel Dinin
Ira Eisenstein
Eugene Kohn
Samuel C. Kohs
Milton Steinberg

Hannah Machlowitz, Secretary

CONTRIBUTING EDITORS

Isaac B. Berkson
Barnett R. Brickner
Alexander M. Dushkin
Jacob S. Golub
Leo L. Honor
Edward L. Israel

The RECONSTRUCTIONIST is published bi-weekly for twenty consecutive issues starting in October, by The Society for the Advancement of Judaism, 15 West 86th St., New York, N. Y. Subscription $1.00 a year; foreign $1.25; individual copy 10 cents. Entered as second class matter January 9, 1935, at the Post Office, New York, N. Y., under the act of March 3, 1879.

The editorials represent the opinions of the editors only.

200

EDITORIALS

The Wrong and Right Approach To the Problem of Divorce

WHILE a group of fifteen Episcopal clergymen are circularizing bishops and priests of their communions, asking them to sign a statement condemning remarriage after divorce, a bill has been introduced into the Wisconsin Legislature by which couples may obtain a divorce by common consent, after the lapse of a year during which the man and woman seeking divorce must live apart. The attitudes expressed in these two items of news represent the wrong and the right approach, respectively, to the problem of divorce. The former attitude is concerned with the affirmation of a traditional canon of the church, presumed to be of divine origin, regardless of social consequences; the latter is concerned with salvaging what can be salvaged from the wreck of a marriage that has gone on the rocks.

Canonical law of the Episcopalian Church permits divorce only on grounds of adultery and refuses remarriage to the "guilty" party. This attitude of the church is frequently written into the law of the state and is thus made binding even upon those who do not accept it as a divine oracle. What is the social consequence of the attempt legally to enforce such a standard? Two people are unhappy in marriage. They want to be free from a bond that has become intolerable. But they cannot be freed, unless one or the other of the two parties is guilty of adultery. Hence one of them actually commits adultery in order to obtain freedom, or permits the other to "frame" evidence supporting a charge of adultery. To be sure, such a framing of the case is collusion and not legally valid. But it can be given the aspect of legality by the further illegal and sacrilegious act of perjury, which is the common resort of people who are too decent to commit adultery for their freedom.

Of course, there is the alternative of remaining legally married while actually living in ascetic celibacy. But who benefits by such a forced union? Surely not the husband and wife. And not the children—assuming that there are children—for a divided home in which the parents hate one another hardly provides a wholesome atmosphere in which to raise children. Does God benefit? It is the assumption of all ethical religion that God is to be identified only with a spirit that is solicitous of human welfare. It is peculiarly ironic that a church which, in its origin, protested that God is Love and not Law, should be so ready to sacrifice the personal happiness of human beings

to the requirements of an authoritarian legal code. Jewish legalism at its worst—and Jewish legalism also sometimes sins against human values—never completely lost sight of the fact that marriage was made for man, not man for marriage. It never departed so far from serving the social and personal needs of men as to insist on canons, the enforcement of which leads to adultery, slander and perjury. If any church wants to hold its own members to the standards laid down by the Episcopalian canons, that is its business; but if it should attempt to force these canons on others by the authority of the state, it will be necessary to oppose them to the utmost.

We therefore commend the proponents of the bill introduced into the Wisconsin Legislature. They are handling the problem of divorce as a social problem which must be approached from the point of view of a reasonable weighing of social consequences. They discourage hasty and ill-considered severance of the marital tie by requiring a year of separation, but they make it possible to obtain a divorce without trumped up charges, without recourse to perjury and without denying to either party the opportunity to seek happiness in a second marriage.

The Religious Education Association

DURING the past few years there has been an increase in the number of organized attempts to promote good will and better relations between Jews and Christians. Good will missions, consisting of a caravan of three speakers, a Protestant, a Catholic and a Jew, have been sent across the country to bring their messages of good tidings to every hamlet in the land. While we have appreciated the good intentions of these missions, and have been cognizant of the good they were doing in promoting better understanding between Jews and Christians, we have often spoken of them indulgently and critically. For it has always been our belief that mere preaching of good will is not enough; that it is necessary to get at the roots of the ill will which prevailed in the world. To extirpate these roots of evil, we feel we must change radically the soil and the climate which make possible the growth of ill will, prejudices and hostility. And among the real roots of ill will are a number of factors: an unjust and inequitable economic order; the arrogant assumption on the part of each faith that it is the sole possessor of divine truth, and the consequent intolerance or supercilious tolerance such an attitude implies; the inculcation in the pupils of thousands of Sunday Schools of attitudes prejudicial to Jews, and the impartation of information historically untrue and misleading and calculated only to deepen the chasm and intensify the hatred between Jew and Christian.

It is therefore with real pleasure that we call attention to the work of the Religious Education Association, which recently completed its annual conference in Cleveland. We may not agree with all the policies of the R.E.A., but we feel that only through associations of this kind will it be possible to tackle the problem of Jewish-Christian relations at its roots, and really make possible the promotion of good will. "The Religious Education Association," so the prospectus of the program of the annual meeting informs us, "is made up of men and women of every faith who hold that the prophetic aspirations of religion are made actual through education. Bound together by confidence in the God-given possibilities of human nature, we seek ways to release the dynamic of religion in the building and rebuilding of the social relationships and institutions responsible for character—the social and the individual belong inseparably together."

The Religious Education Association consists of ministers, priests, rabbis and lay educators interested in religious education. These are the men who mould the opinions of their congregants and who control

the religious education of the children entrusted to them. The R.E.A. is not afraid to tackle basic problems, "to stir around on the frontier of social issues." It is not an action group, but a discussing and agitating group. It tries as far as possible to limit itself to one outstanding problem at each annual meeting. Thus its recent meeting was devoted to the topic: Education and Authority in Church and State. Special sessions were devoted to such problems as Growing Threats to Religious Liberty, Problems of Religious Education With Regard to the Exercise of Authority in either Church or State, Which Liberty Does Religion Require?, Educating for the Exercise and Defense of the Liberty Religion Requires, and How Shall Individual and Churches Meet the Unwarranted Exercise of Authority?

After listening and talking to the members of the R.E.A., one begins to realize that here are really men and women of good will. To be sure, the Catholic clergy are not largely represented, and only the liberals among the Protestants and the Jews are to be found in the ranks of the R.E.A. But the R.E.A. does represent a large and growing number of religiously organized Jews and Christians and its influence extends far beyond its own membership. For being religious educators, they have not limited themselves to talking; they have individually and severally worked out new curricula, new text books, new techniques and methods in the teaching of Bible, Church history, religion, tolerance,—which reckon with the roots of ill will to which we have referred.

We are indebted to the R.E.A. for the many innovations and experiments in Christian Sunday Schools throughout the land made possible by its members, which have attempted to give the Christian children a fairer and truer estimate of Jewish life and history of the past and a truer understanding and appreciation of the Jews of today. In such revaluations of Christian teaching lies the basis for real understanding and good will. We hope more of the rabbis and educators will participate in the work of the R.E.A. Together with the liberal men of the Christian faith, they can become the true ambassadors of good will.

The Catholic Crusade Against Communism

By Louis Minsky

INTELLIGENT non-Catholics are probably puzzled and more than a little concerned over the current Catholic crusade against communism. The outbreak of the Civil War in Spain, followed by the recent Papal message on communism, has been the signal for a gathering campaign by the Church in the United States.

Concern arises not from the drive against communism *per se,* since every non-Catholic with the religious instinct is opposed to communism. It derives from the fear that this crusade, by not taking a stand against extremes of the right as well as of the left, may become the unwitting tool of those who are using the cry of communism to stifle social progress of any sort, even to crush the social movement which is developing within Church and Synagogue.

Puzzlement springs from the fact that the Catholic Church believes communism to be such an imminent danger in this country as to warrant a crusade of such proportions. For it is a source of genuine perplexity to many non-Catholics that really intelligent Catholic leaders and editors believe communism to be the foremost menace confronting the United States. I believe this is not only an exaggeration of the actual strength of communist sentiment but is also an underestimation of the temperament and makeup of the American people to whom such a

doctrine as communism is completely alien. I think that if there is any danger at all it lies in the opposite direction. The menace is that the forces of economic and social reaction may seize power.

However, whether or not one agrees with Catholic contentions about the strength of communism, it is important that non-Catholics should not generalize about this movement by waving it away as a reactionary campaign. An accurate knowledge of the makeup of this crusade is indispensable for the sake of justice and truth. For while the campaign undoubtedly has some sponsors who are playing into the hands of reactionaries, it is a mistake to believe that these men are representative of the whole Church. There are three schools of thought in this anti-communist crusade and they may be broadly termed as "left," "centre," and "right."

The middle school of thought consists of those bishops, clergy and laymen who are fighting communism and nothing else. They are not fighting movements which are called "communism" in the heat of debate. And they are not fighting social justice efforts under the guise of doing battle against Marxism. Nor are they allying themselves with reactionary forces intent upon crushing social movements. To this school of thought communism must be eradicated chiefly for one reason and that is because it is atheistic. Some adherents of this school, such as Msgr. Fulton J. Sheen of Catholic University of America, have gone so far as to state publicly that the economic motives behind communism are commendable.

I believe that the attitude of this group may best be exemplified by a quotation from a recent editorial in *America,* well known Jesuit organ. Discussing attempts made by left-wing secular writers to identify the Catholic Church with the forces of reaction because it is an enemy of communism, the editorial says:

"Hearst attacks communism on a low principle and the Catholic Church opposes it on a high, and totally distinct, principle. . . . Wall Street seeks the death penalty for communism for money reasons; the Catholic Church condemns Marxism for soul reasons . . . fascism and Nazism swear implacable hatred against communism for national and material reasons; the Catholic Church stands squarely against its ideology for purely spiritual reasons; but communist propagandists make it appear that Catholicism is fascist. The Catholic Church is not allied with Hearst, Wall Street, Mussolini, Hitler, or the Republican Party. It would oppose communism even though Hearst were Stalin, and Wall Street were Red Square, and Mussolini were Lenin, and Hitler were Browder, and Republicans went Marxist. Apart from all governments, all parties, all economic systems, the Catholic Church will remain anti-communist as long as communism is atheistic. When communism ceases to be atheistic it will cease to be communistic."

Moreover, this school of thought, realizing that the Church is fighting communism relentlessly to the bitter end, is aware of the danger and injustice of using the communist label indiscriminately. In consequence, we have such statements as the following, addressed to Catholics by Bishop James H. Ryan of Omaha during the past political campaign when the Red scare was used against President Roosevelt:

"The Catholic Church is unitedly and unalterably opposed to communism in all its manifestations. Between us and communism there can be no truce. It is war to the death. Given this fact, it is a very serious charge, as far as we are concerned, to accuse anyone of being a communist. Unless such charge is based on irrefutable arguments and founded in fact, to make it so jauntily as it has been made and without any real evidence, is to do a great disservice both to the Church and the State. And the men who do so will one day have to answer for the wrongs they do before a much higher tribunal than that of American public opinion."

The second school of thought is that adumbrated by the Social Action Depart-

ment of the National Catholic Welfare Conference and its Directors, Msgr. John A. Ryan and Father R. A. McGowan. This may be called the "left" school. It is composed of liberal Catholics who proceed upon the theory that the most effective way to eradicate communism is to eliminate its economic causes. This school has been least susceptible to the Red scare. If anything, it has become more militant for social justice in proportion as the "right" wing of the Church has increased its agitation against communism.

This group is well aware of the danger of the crusade against communism developing into a reactionary campaign unless it is coupled with a constructive social program. It is one of the most lamentable aspects of the present crusade that it has obscured the movement begun this Spring by the National Catholic Welfare Conference to popularize the social and economic principles of "Rerum Novarum" and "Quadrigesimo Anno." On the other hand, it is encouraging that this school has seized upon the cooperative movement as a means of promoting economic democracy. The success of the cooperative experiment in Nova Scotia for which the priests at St. Francis Xavier University at Antigonish are largely responsible has created a profound impression in some Catholic circles in this country. It is, therefore, not without significance that the theme of cooperatives as a solution for the economic ills of rural sections ran as a thread throughout the deliberations of the National Catholic Rural Life Conference held recently in North Dakota. It is also not without significance that at the recent Cooperative Congress the Rev. G. A. McDonald, S.J., of St. Louis, one of the leaders of Catholic Youth activities in this country, pledged the aid of the Catholic Church in developing the cooperative movement, and that in a later statement Father McDonald announced complete endorsement of the cooperative movement, included credit unions, and producers' and consumers' cooperatives, and asserted that the cooperative movement would be propagated through sodalities in all parts of the country.

The third category is that composed of clergymen and laymen who are clearly playing into the hands of reaction, whose hatred of communism is so bitter that it is directed against every sort of social movement, including the social movement in the Protestant Churches. In this category are priests who write articles in Hearst newspapers against communism and who ally themselves with movements sponsored by Hearst to combat other movements which Hearst labels communistic. These priests are opposed to free speech for communists and those whom Hearst calls communists, which may mean any individual who holds any progressive social opinion. I am glad to note that one such priest who has been making quite a nuisance of himself has been rebuked by other Catholics.

To this class we may further add the kind of priest who spoke at a regional conference of a group of clergymen and laymen that has been distributing literature accusing the Federal Council of Churches of preaching communism, and in a vitriolic address, exceeding those of Father Coughlin for vituperation and misstatement, virtually accused Protestant preachers of disseminating communism through their pulpits.

Also to this school of thought we may add those Catholic bishops and clergy who are principal speakers at meetings of this same organization of clergymen and laymen which has been shunned by every Protestant clergyman of any standing and which, under the guise of combatting communism, has been denouncing the Federal Council of Churches and so-called "radicalism" in the Protestant Churches. In allying themselves with this movement these Catholics place themselves open to suspicion by Protestants because they are identifying themselves with a group which is looked upon with deep distrust.

And yet, in observing this "right" wing group, one notes some curious paradoxes. Here, for example, are priests denouncing

pacifists as communists, whereas a society of conscientious objectors of the Catholic faith has just been organized under the auspices of The Catholic Worker. Here are bishops labelling as "communist" leaders who are fighting for the rights of workers, yet if the struggle for labor is a criterion of communism, then Father McGowan is a dangerous radical. Does this mean that social action is to be condoned only if it is carried on under Catholic auspices?

This extreme school of thought is repudiated, I am sure, by the more intelligent and thoughtful members of the clergy and laity. Like the Protestants, the Catholics have their extremists and irresponsible elements. Unlike the Protestants and the Jews, Catholics do not indulge in introspection or self-criticism —at least not publicly, so that if we do not hear a Catholic extremist denounced we are likely to be deceived into concluding that what he says or does is endorsed by all Catholics.

An Experiment in Applied Religion

By Albert I. Gordon*

SINCE May of 1934, I have arbitrated over five hundred labor disputes in Minneapolis. During that time, I have been the official arbitrator and conciliator for the Laundry and Dry Cleaning Industries of Minneapolis. I have drawn up wage agreements and have arbitrated the disputes of the laundry drivers in the same industry. At other times, I have been called upon to settle differences between the upholsterers and their employers, the machinists and their employers. Differences of opinion between the Fur Workers' Union and plant owners have also been referred to me.

During the past three years, I have had intimate contact with laboring men and women in many different industries. I have addressed Union meetings, and been invited to the meetings of Employers' Associations. During this period of time, peaceful relations have been successfully maintained in the Laundry and Dry Cleaning Industries, with its eighteen hundred employees and seventy-nine employers—an industry which has been notorious for its many and bitter labor conflicts.

How I happened to be called upon to lend my effort to bring about peace in this industry, it is difficult to say. In order that the reader should acquire a clear and proper understanding of the nature of the labor difficulties into which I was drawn, it is perhaps best that I review the strife-ridden history of Minneapolis since the Spring of 1934.

I

Minneapolis had occupied the center of the stage in the industrial world for many months because of its numerous strikes. In May 1934, the powerful Truck Drivers' Union began a strike which tied up local industry completely and effectively. Pitched battles on the city's streets and bloodshed helped no little to bring Minneapolis to the forefront of the industrial stage. Our labor troubles constituted "front page news." This strike, with its rioting and the battle of "Deputy Run" in which one Deputy Sheriff was killed, made it clear to all that labor was in no conciliatory mood. Labor as a unit had cut all bridges behind it, and was determined to fight for its rights.

During the period of that strike, the Laundry and Dry Cleaners' Union, Local 18005 A. F. of L., issued a series of demands upon their employers. They, in turn, hastened to the offices of the Regional Labor Board for advice and aid. They

*Rabbi, Adath Jeshurun Synagogue, Minneapolis, Minn.

were informed that the Board could be of assistance only to the extent of holding an official election in all of the Laundry and Dry Cleaning establishments for the purpose of determining how many, if any, of the employees really wished to be represented by the Union. The subsequent election indicated that twelve hundred employees wanted such representation.

The employers, upon meeting with a committee of Union representatives, were adamant in their refusal to grant any of the demands of the Union; demands which included a substantial wage increase, reduction of hours of labor, Union recognition and an abatement of the many evils which had sprung up throughout the industry. Threatened once again with a strike, the employers found no way out other than to suggest that the terms of an agreement be arbitrated. The Union, then not strong enough to carry on a prolonged strike, agreed to this request. Strangely, though I had never had any contacts with the Union leaders, and though several of the largest plant owners in the city were members of my congregation, both sides invited me to serve as arbiter.

I will confess that it was not an easy matter for me to decide whether or not to accept this invitation. I was aware of the fact that my own congregants, two of them members of the Board of the Congregation, were directly involved in the dispute. Both of them, I knew, were unfriendly to organized labor. Any decisions I rendered were likely to involve an increase in wages and a change in conditions which might not prove acceptable to these men. There was, however, the greater temptation—the opportunity to experiment in applied religion, to apply the principles of justice and of fair dealing as I understood them, to a practical situation. In a very real sense then, my own future was at stake. Was it worth the effort?

I resolved upon a course of action. I called upon these Board members, and frankly explained the situation to them. I told them that there was likely to be an occasion during the meetings which were to follow when I, in the interest of equity and justice, would be obliged to render decisions against them. I explained what I meant by "applied religion," and informed them that I regarded this as a rare opportunity to be of service. Would they, knowing that their own businesses and personal fortunes were at stake, want me to undertake the experiment?

The frank statement elicited an equally frank response. I was assured that all that was wanted of me was "to get the facts." If, after I had acquired the facts, I rendered any decisions which affected them adversely, they would be men enough to understand my motives. Given this assurance, although even then I was not certain that I could entirely rely upon it, I accepted the invitation to serve as arbiter. In that manner, I began a task which was to prove one of the most interesting and challenging of my rabbinical experience.

I proceeded at once to acquire as complete a knowledge of the industry and its problems as was possible. I found both employers and employees helpful and cooperative. There followed many stormy meetings, involving the presentation of additional facts and added testimony. During this trying period, it was not uncommon for me to be obliged to assume the duties of referee when name calling and reflections upon the ancestry of both employers' and employees' representatives were frequently uttered.

Approximately one month elapsed before there was even the semblance of agreement. And then, agreement was only reached after I presented what I considered a fair wage scale. I was obliged to place Union and Employer representatives in separate rooms and walk between the two rooms in order to secure acceptance of my opinions. As a result of this strenuous night of negotiations which began at 8 P.M. and lasted until 3 A.M., both sides unanimously agreed to accept the terms that I had proposed.

Both sides were, of course, legally, as well as morally, bound to accept whatever decisions I rendered. The question may therefore be raised, why it was at all necessary to spend so much time in discussion. It it at this point that I apply my first conclusion with reference to the workability of arbitration. It appears to me that arbitration will work only if both parties to the dispute understand and agree with the reasoning of the arbiter—if they understand how and why he has arrived at his decisions; if they can be made to appreciate the principles of justice that are involved in his decisions.

These and other meetings subsequently resulted in the drawing up of an agreement which involved a substantial increase in pay for the workers, the reduction of working hours and the elimination of many evils in the industry. Forty-two plant owners whose employees had voted for Union representation signed this agreement.

By far the most valuable and important contribution to this agreement was the establishment of a permanent Board of Arbitration which was to meet regularly during the life of the agreement for the purpose of settling any and all differences arising from it. I shall later attempt to point out the importance of this feature to the future welfare of the industry.

During that first year of service as Impartial Chairman of the Board of Arbitration, I am pleased to state that, with both the representatives of labor and capital seated around the table, listening to the testimony presented, and with most cases presented by labor, the decisions in every single case were unanimous. This Board, which has been meeting regularly for the past three years, and has heard over five hundred disputes, has yet to render a decision which is not based upon the unanimous opinion of both employers and employees. Such unanimity of opinion would seem to indicate that at times some agreement is possible betwen capital and labor.

Since 1934, three agreements have been written and accepted by both parties. Today, Union recognition is a fact. Wages have been increased by twenty-five percent. Additional safeguards in the interests of the employees are being added from time to time. That the employees are satisfied with this arrangement is evidenced by their insistance that every agreement include the assurance that there will be a permanent Board of Arbitration. That the employers are satisfied is indicated by the fact that, when our first agreement was signed, there were but forty-two employers who were willing to agree, and then they did so only because they did not dare to oppose the Regional Labor Board. Today, without a police force to enforce our decisions, and with no power other than moral suasion, seventy-nine employers—every plant owner in Minneapolis—are now parties to this agreement. Three full years of peace, free from strikes and lockouts, have thus been obtained. In this industry, arbitration is no longer regarded as an experiment. It is conceded to mean the salvation of the industry.

II

One may surmise that these years have taught the employers and employees valuable lessons in cooperation. They have, in addition, provided a wealth of experience to the Chairman of the Board of Arbitration. As a rabbi, seeking to apply the lessons and teachings of religion to the practical problems of everyday living, I have had the opportunity to observe, under close range, the attitudes of employers, as well as employees. I have acquired some valuable lessons in the study of human nature. Furthermore, these experiences have provided me with an excellent opportunity for reflection upon the all important subject, "What role can a religious leader play in the practical task of achieving social justice in the community?"

Are we, however, all agreed that the rabbi, priest and minister have any right, by virtue of their philosophies, to concern themselves with economic and social questions? There are, unfortunately,

far too many religious leaders who conceive of religion almost entirely in terms of otherworldliness. There are many clergymen who find that looking after the welfare of men's souls is of far greater concern to them than regard for the welfare of men's bodies. They refuse to believe that religion, as indicated by the late Dr. Edmund Chaffee, is "man's whole self, facing the eternal problems of life and destiny, seeking to be at one with the basic forces of the universe." Nor do they comprehend that Israel's scriptural writings constitute an attempt to prescribe for man a way of life which will at once bring him comfort and peace here and now.

"And it shall come to pass, if ye hearken diligently unto My commandments, which I command you this day, to love the Lord your God, and to serve Him with all your heart and all your soul, that I will give the rain of your land in its season, the former rain and the latter rain, that thou mayest gather in thy corn and thy wine and thine oil." How clearly the Bible puts it! The reward for observance is not to be obtained in the distant future after man has passed from the land of the living. Rather, he is to receive his reward in this world in the form of food, clothing and shelter.

The religious leader of today dare not evade the challenge of the present. He dare not forget that undernourished, ill-clothed, bedraggled men and women who labor by the sweat of their brow to earn the barest necessities of life, are not likely to place much faith or confidence in a diet of otherworldliness or well meaning abstractions. Religion, if it is to have meaning and significance to men and women today, must be applied to the human problems which all men face today. When our ancestors applied their religion to their daily lives, it brought them happiness. It had meaning for them. When they ceased to apply it, it lost its significance for them.

It may be that the vast majority of laboring men and women, the manual workers and day laborers among our people, have drifted away from the synagogue simply because we, the religious leaders, have taken too little interest in the problems which have weighed them down.

Today, however, when various synagogue and church bodies issue their pronouncements on social justice, translating fundamental theological doctrines into concrete positive statements of opposition to all forms of human exploitation; when rabbis urge and support legislation which will deal effectively with practical instances of human oppression and exploitation, we have at last reason to believe that some religious leaders have awakened to their moral responsibility. May their numbers increase!

An awareness of human problems and a sense of responsibility to cope with these problems is, however, insufficient. If we are to deal effectively with the evils of our day, we must become even keener students of human nature than we are at present. A good heart and a sympathetic regard for our fellow man and his problems will not in themselves overcome any evil. We must be ready and willing to acquire both a theoretical and a practical knowledge of present day society. We must, in other words, become trained sociologists and economists. We must make it our business to know the men and women whose problems we discuss. We must search for causes before we can suggest remedies.

It is precisely because so many of us have failed to acquire this necessary background and knowledge that our opinions and judgments are so frequently ignored. Patients are not prone to accept the advice of physicians whose knowledge of medicine is notoriously inadequate.

Those of us who are concerned with achieving what we call social justice, often speak of social justice as if it were something very positive and definite—something about which all men can agree without a moment's hesitation. Practically, that is not so. A little reflection soon makes it evident that social and economic justice is not fixed and definite for all men. For each of us belongs to different groups, and we have, therefore, different

interests. Our definition of social and economic justice depends upon the groups to which we belong—whether, for example, we be employees or employers, manual workers or brain workers, hod carriers or bank presidents. What is just for one man may not be just for another.

III

The sociologist, Novicow, once wrote on "The Universality of Struggle." He meant to imply that struggle is of the very essence of life. It cannot be completely avoided. Whether that struggle be economic, political, intellectual, or even physiological, we must recognize that every human being enters into some form of struggle with every other human being. And what is more, we all enjoy conflict and struggle. When fifty thousand people pay their good money to see two football teams "fight it out," or when one hundred thousand people attend boxing matches, we are seeing a practical demonstration of how basic and fundamental is that urge to struggle, and how ready and willing we are to take sides in every conflict.

And we do, indeed, take sides in hundreds of different conflicts every single day. The groups to which we belong, the societies, lodges, synagogues, political organizations, indeed the very families of which we are a part are always involved in a struggle against other families or parties or societies or races. Struggle is as inevitable as the rising of tomorrow's sun. Whether we like it or no, we can do nothing about it. If that premise be granted, a premise utilized by every sociologist and psychologist of repute, we, as religious leaders, would still have no occasion to lose faith in the attainment of a world which is socially just. We will perhaps be a bit less impatient with those who do not see eye to eye with us on every issue, and we will certainly be more prone to think in terms of achieving our ends through the ofttimes slow yet highly important method of compromise. Should we, who are obliged to make compromises daily in our homes and in our work, be less prone to accept compromise as the only satisfactory means for achieving some degree of social and economic justice?

Unless, like God, we deliberately destroy one world and one society in order to achieve another, we have no alternative other than to take society as it exists today and slowly but surely reshape it into a better and more acceptable pattern.

The religious leader then has but one avenue of approach open to him. He must seek not to eliminate conflict completely (because that seems impossible), but rather he must seek to narrow down the field of conflict and to institutionalize the channels of conflict wherever possible. He must seek to create institutions such as Courts, Boards of Arbitration and Conciliation to which men can bring their disputes. He must also see to it that the general public is affected as little as possible by these disputes.

Society long ago learned that differences of opinion need not be settled by physical strength or by the sword. Today, when men dispute, they are obliged to bring their disputes before the institutions we call the courts. There they receive what society arbitrarily calls justice. Here then is an instance of the manner in which society has learned to channelize conflict through institutions.

We who are opposed to war are favorable to international courts of arbitration because we recognize the fact that though conflicts between nations may be inevitable, these conflicts can be settled with least expense to society and to the nations involved through such institutions as international courts. That all men and all nations do not see eye to eye with us, is simply another challenge to the religious leader. He must use whatever gifts he has to cause more men to see the advantages of such a method.

These institutions which man has created and developed are indispensable to human welfare. Reason tells us that cat and dog fights, or demonstrations of brute strength, do not in themselves constitute evidence which is likely to tell us which

of the parties to the dispute has justice on his side. If this is true in the ordinary differences among men, if it be true in the disputes between nations, why do we not apply the same methods and techniques to labor problems? Three years of work as arbiter have convinced me that voluntary arbitration is about as satisfactory a means for dispensing justice to employers and employees as any method yet devised. Here then we have the institution for remedying many of the ills of present day society. It reduces to a minimum unnecessary hardship which is usually worked upon the public. What is more, both labor and capital are turning to arbitration as a way out of their difficulties.

I am opposed to compulsory arbitration in labor disputes, because I believe that compulsion usually works to the disadvantage of labor. It helps to maintain the status quo. It simply adds fuel to the already blazing fire of conflict between the two groups. It may be that other devices, institutions or techniques will be developed which may reduce conflict to an even greater extent. Perhaps State socialism or Government ownership, or control of public utilities, or cooperatives will solve parts of the problem. That remains to be seen. There is no reason why any religious leader who, after study and investigation, is convinced that any of the suggested methods will solve present problems, should not or ought not to work for their realization. A realistic view, however, demands that we utilize that instrumentality which has thus far proved most acceptable to most people. Such an instrumentality I consider voluntary arbitration to be.

IV

I believe that religious leaders can help to achieve a world which is more socially and economically just, if they use their good offices to acquaint the public with the advantages of such institutions; if they take advantage of their unusual opportunity to be the moulders of public opinion.

Both capital and labor are today dependent upon the good will of the public. Public opinion is extremely powerful today. Why then do we religious leaders not seek to influence and mould that opinion to a greater extent than we have yet done? We have the pulpit, the press, radio, public meetings, personal contacts to utilize in behalf of a cause which to us seems just. We are in an unusual position to sponsor legislation, to persuade, to cajole, and if necessary, to publicize the evils which we see round about us.

We must learn to utilize every existing agency which seeks to deal with specific phases of injustice. The religious leader should not only lend his support to these movements, but assume the leadership when possible. He should feel that just societies are impossible of attainment until we have helped to make our own families, congregations, societies, cities and states think in terms of justice. He should be as willing to fight and uncover rackets and corruption in public office as he is to deliver sermons on social justice. The religious leader should refuse to condone wrong doing, whether the wrong doers be public officials, racketeers, employers, employees, or even members of his own congregation. He should, in the manner of the Prophets of old, seek the truth as he knows it. He should keep his own hand unsullied. He should maintain his own integrity. The religious leader, if he is to play any practical role in the achievement of social justice, must not only derive his inspiration from the past, but also know the conditions which men face today. And he must courageously raise his voice on behalf of the exploited and oppressed among all peoples. That—is applied religion!

The Resurrection of The Jewish Spirit

By MORDECAI M. KAPLAN

THE revival of the Jewish people in Palestine is essentially an organic and indivisible process. Yet, if we are to judge from the manner in which it is being consummated, that revival seems to call for two distinct types of endeavor: one, the type which emanates from the will to life physical; the other, the type which emanates from the will to life spiritual. That fact is in keeping with the famous vision of the ancient prophet, Ezekiel. Finding himself in the midst of a valley filled with the bones of slain men, he hears the voice of God commanding him to call upon those bones to come to life. Ezekiel obeys. There is a stirring among the bones; they come together, bone to bone, and cover themselves with sinews, flesh and skin. But there is still no life in them. The prophet is then told to invoke the breath of life. "Come from the four ends of the earth, O breath, and breathe life into these corpses," Ezekiel cries out. Only then do they become animate, and are ready to take their place among the living.

The fostering of the Hebrew University on Mount Scopus belongs to the second type of endeavor which is essential to the resurrection of the Jewish people in Palestine. It is the endeavor to supplement the physical assembling of the dispersed of our people with that which will generate in them spirit and soul. The Hebrew University of Jerusalem is both a symbol and an instrument of the intellectual, cultural and spiritual development of the Jewish settlement in Palestine, without which that settlement would be little more than a chance aggregate of human beings driven thither by the ruthless violence of their fellow-men. Though the Hebrew University is not the only instrument which will enable Palestine Jewry to achieve soul, or the life of the spirit, it unquestionably can prove to be the most effective instrument for that purpose. This is why it merits the whole-hearted interest of every Jew who is vitally concerned that the life of his people shall be enhanced to the uttermost.

In referring to the Hebrew University as a symbol and an instrument of the life of the spirit, I am aware that I am using a term which calls for explanation. "Spirit" is a word of many meanings. If, therefore, we use it to bespeak an interest in any cause or undertaking, we should set forth specifically what it denotes for us, at least in relation to that cause or undertaking. I shall therefore indicate the concrete results which may well issue from the spiritual quality that the Hebrew University can contribute to the life of the Jewish settlement in Palestine.

I

In the first place, the Hebrew University is bound to facilitate for the Jews in Palestine the process of synthesizing the Jewish heritage with the best in the civilizations of mankind. To be sure, Jewish life, to exist anywhere, is nowadays in need of effecting such synthesis. But only in Palestine can that synthesis be achieved in terms dictated by Jewish life itself, instead of by the outside world, as is certain to be the case in the diaspora.

We know what has happened to Jews who have been content with accepting their emancipation at the hands of the non-Jews. Political emancipation has led to spiritual servility, as Ahad Ha-Am has convincingly proved. No freedom can be used aright that is not accompanied by inner freedom of the spirit; no emancipation can bear fruit unless it is also self-emancipation. The yearning for self-emancipation is the drive behind the movement for the physical upbuilding of Palestine. But this need for self-determination is even more imperative in the case of enlightenment than it is in the case of freedom. Enlightenment must be self-enlightenment, if it is to mark cul-

tural growth or transformation. No culture or education can be an influential factor in one's life, unless it is self-culture and self-education.

Jews as individuals have availed themselves, with the avidity of starved men, of the opportunities for intellectual achievement formerly denied them. But they did so almost entirely in terms dictated by the outside world and their own individual interests. That Jews have distinguished themselves in all phases of intellectual achievement is a matter of common knowledge, and is attested by the disproportionate number of Nobel Prize winners who happen to be of Jewish descent. But, collectively, Jews have neither contributed to the achievements of those distinguished men, nor have they benefited by those achievements. These days we are even being treated to the spectacle of one of them entering a lawsuit against a Jewish publisher for having included him in a Jewish "Who's Who."

As a consequence of the fact that Jews have individually achieved high cultural attainments, in terms other than those which grow out of the inner needs of Jewish life, one of three things happens—either they are dejudaized altogether, or they hold their Judaism at arm's length from their general thought-life, or they acquire the kind of superficialized occidentalism which may be characterized as Levantine.

In the Hebrew University, where the best of modern thought can be fused with the permanent values of the Jewish heritage through the living needs of collective Jewish life, we are bound to behold the functioning of the spirit, since one of the distinctive marks of the spirit in human endeavor is the power to rise above mere passivity and subjection to outer forces, and to be, so to speak, an unmoved mover, self-determining and creative.

II

A further evidence of the spiritual quality which it is within the power of the Hebrew University to confer upon Jewish life is the fact that the Hebrew University constitutes the highest common denominator for unity and cooperation among Jews. It can, therefore, redeem Jews from the tendency to fall back all too often for mutual aid and encouragement upon the lowest common denominator, namely, fear and danger.

There is nothing sacrosanct about human solidarity as such. You find solidarity in beehives, buffalo herds, sheep-flocks and wolf-packs. Common dangers, whether real or imaginary, drive human beings into forming themselves into cooperative groups. But it is usually a form of cooperation that stifles individuality in the members of the group, and is a menace to other groups. Solidarity attains a spiritual level only in the higher reaches of human interest and enterprise, when it is motivated by the desire to be creative in the domain of truth, goodness and beauty.

How necessary it is for Jews to discover that there is something that unites them besides anti-Semitism! No matter how unwarranted the hatred, or how unjust the ostracism, by themselves they cannot constitute a bond of fellowship that is welcome and productive of good. Nothing is more unwholesome and more demoralizing to Jewish integrity than the morbid interest in all possible manifestations of Jew-hatred, an interest which practically monopolizes the output of the Jewish press and the discussions at Jewish forums, and even the conversation of Jews with one another. A project like the Hebrew University, and the numerous activities which it can unfold, might lead to concrete achievements that might even mitigate the hostility against us. But a far more important outcome is bound to be that enrichment of the content of Jewish life which would redeem it from its present cultural sterility.

It seems absurd for Jews to be forever harping upon their glorious past as evidence of their indispensability to civilization. That which the Egyptians, the Babylonians, the Greeks and the Romans have added to the sum of civilization has be-

come part of the texture of human life, and does not need those ancient peoples to guard it. The best which our own ancestors have given to the world does not need us to perpetuate it, and is, therefore, by itself no valid reason for holding us together. Only present creativity can be our raison d'etre, and a functioning bond of unity. The Hebrew University, in affording a field for creativity of the highest order, and in thus constituting the highest common denominator among Jews throughout the world, with all their wide diversity in interests, world outlook and aspirations, is an incontestable witness to the reality and power of the spirit.

III

Finally, my justification for regarding the Hebrew University as contributing spiritual quality to the Jewish settlement in Palestine is that I understand by "spiritual" whatever elicits the best in human beings. The best of which a people is capable is, first, to afford the individuals who constitute it the freedom to realize themselves to the utmost, and, secondly, to evolve such universal values in the fields of knowledge and human relations as can promote cooperation among nations for their common good. Both these attributes of a people no institution or activity is so calculated to foster as its institutions of higher learning. It is their function to promulgate the spirit of sweet reasonableness and fair dealing, to conquer ignorance and dispel prejudice, to widen men's interests and enlarge their sympathies.

The principle of free inquiry is our only guarantee that human society will ultimately achieve a sure footing in truth, and manage to free itself from the slough of despair in which it is at present sunk. With frenzied political sects beating the tom-tom of their various fanaticisms, and with governments regimenting men's thoughts and feelings, the institutions of higher learning are reason's last barricade. When universities surrender their right to free inquiry, the nation to which they belong can no longer be accounted sane.

Let us Jews, therefore, be grateful that in the very midst of seething passions, at the crossroad of the three great religions of the world, and on the highway that connects three continents—a highway that is sodden with the blood of numberless victims slain in wars incited by greed and lust for power—rises our Hebrew University, dedicated to the search for truth in things and goodness in man. With the same devotion to truth that the Hebrew University discovers ways and means of fighting malaria and locusts, it succeeds in retrieving sacred treasures of the Mohammedan peoples, who treat the Jews as a thorn in their side. Surely these achievements may well rank with the best of which a people is capable, and in eliciting them the Hebrew University is making a definite contribution to the life of the spirit.

If we want it, the Hebrew University can mean for the Jewish people of our day what the Temple meant to our ancestors in days of old. It can serve as a palladium in safeguarding those traits of our people which constitute its most precious treasure. Those traits are the urge to spiritual self-determination, the urge to unity on the basis of the highest common need—the need to be creative—, and the urge to utilize the love of truth and the passion for humanity as a means of eliciting the best of which our people is capable. By serving in this capacity, the Hebrew University on Mount Scopus can, in the words of our ancient prophet, "give soul to the people, and spirit to them that live in the land."